

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,910	08/06/2001	Donald F. Gordon	SEDN/113CON2	9300
56015 7590 01/28/2008 PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/			EXAMINER	
SEDNA PATE	ENT SERVICES, LLC		SHANG, ANNAN Q	
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SUITE 100 SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
			MẠIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		<i>€</i> ••				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Antique Comment	09/922,910	GORDON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Annan Q. Shang	2623				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 h	November 2007.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Thi	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	·					
	4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
<u> </u>	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
••						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin		by the Examiner				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documen						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	-	n received in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	A acceptant				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies no	t received.				
Attachment(s)		•				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/19/07</u> .	6) Other:					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

 Applicant's arguments filed 11/19/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1-19, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Knudson et al (6,016,141)** in view of **Hendricks et al (6,201,536)**, applicant discusses the prior arts of record and the claimed invention and argues that the prior arts do not teach the claim limitations, i.e., fails to teach or suggest "...at least the providing a set of more than two on-demand programs..." that "...packaging the set into a subset having at least two on-demand programs of the set of on-demand programs..." etc., (see pages 5 of 8+ of Applicant's Remarks).

In responses, Examiner notes Applicant's arguments, however, the Examiner disagrees. Knudson teaches a server (MF/TV-DF 22/26) which provides a set of more than two programs; packaging the set into a subset having at least two programs (fig.1 col.3, lines 9-21 and col.4, line 22-col.5, line 16), provides a user interface (figs.2 and 7-9, col.4, lines 16-col.5, line 16) having the subset as a selectable object, the user interface configured to allow selection of the selectable object representing the subset of at least two programs to be purchased as a package for on-demand access (fig.6, col.4, line 38-col.5, line 30, line 52-col.6, line 57 and col.7, line 5-59) and further discloses making programs available for impulse purchasing and offering multiple packages of programs (near video-on-demand (NVOD), PPV, etc.,) to subscribers for purchasing on a daily, weekly, monthly, etc., Although Knudson teaches NVOD, PPV,

Application/Control Number:

09/922,910

Art Unit: 2623

IPPV, et., Knudson is silent as to VOD. However, in the same field of endeavor, **Hendricks** discloses network manager for cable TV system Head-ends, which provides program packages, IPPV, NVOD, VVOD, VOD, etc., upon request from subscribers (figs.1-8, col.6, lines 56-65, col.4, line 1-14, col.8, line 8-col.9, line 38 and col.18, line 1-col.19, line 1+). Hence, the 103(a) rejection is proper, meets all the claim limitations, maintained as repeated below.

As to applicant arguments as to "The test under...103 is...would have been obvious or non-obvious; rather the test is whether the claimed invention, considered as a whole, would have been obvious...", Examiner maintains that, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporate into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. In this case all references are in the same field of endeavor as such combining the teaching of Knudson with Hendricks would be within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and appropriate motivation was given.

Furthermore it appears Applicant's arguments are directed against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In view of the above, the combination of Knudson and Hendricks is proper and maintained as repeated below. This Office Action is made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al (6,016,141) in view of Hendricks et al (6,201,536).

As to claim 1, note **Knudson** reference figures 1-11 discloses interactive TV program guide system with pay program package promotion and further discloses an interactive information distribution system containing service provider equipment and subscriber equipment (set-top terminal) that is interconnected by a communications network, the method of providing a subscription-on-demand service, comprising:

(MF/TV-DF 22/26) providing a set of more than two programs; packaging the set into a subset having at least two programs (fig.1 col.3, lines 9-21 and col.4, line 22-col.5, line 16).

Providing a user interface (figs.2 and 7-9, col.4, lines 16-col.5, line 16) having the subset as a selectable object, the user interface configured to allow selection of the selectable object representing the subset of at least two programs to be purchased as a

package for on-demand access (fig.6, col.4, line 38-col.5, line 30, line 52-col.6, line 57 and col.7, line 5-59).

Knudson teaches making programs available for impulse purchasing and offering multiple packages of programs (near video-on-demand (NVOD), PPV, etc.,) to subscribers for purchasing on a daily, weekly, monthly, etc., basis, but fails to explicitly teach providing VOD or on-demand program services.

However, **Hendricks** discloses network manager for cable TV system Headends, which provides program packages, IPPV, NVOD, VVOD, VOD, etc., upon request from subscribers (figs.1-8, col.6, lines 56-65, col.4, line 1-14, col.8, line 8-col.9, line 38 and col.18, line 1-col.19, line 1+).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Hendricks into the system of Knudson to include VOD service in addition to the other services, and offer purchasable promotional packages of VOD or on-demand programs to the subscriber on subscription basis.

As to claims 2-7, Knudson further discloses where in response to selection of the selectable object representing the subset of the at least two programs causing subscription to the programming package, providing a time limited access period to the subset of at least two programs without incurring an additional fee, providing a time limited to access period to the subset of the at least two programs, subscription to the package at a predefined price, where the predefined price is one-time access fee and where the one-time access fee has time-limited period of access (fig.6, col.5, line 17-col.6, line 57 and col.7, line 5-59).

09/922,910

Art Unit: 2623

As to claims 8-19, Knudson further discloses programming package where the programming packages are arrange in a hierarchical package of programming, comprising multiple program packages including a top level package including all of the at least two programs and at least one particular package including only a portion of the at least on-demand programs, one particular package with respective portion of at least two programs, defined according to content categories comprises one or more sports, particular teams, etc., (col.6, line 5-35) to enable a user to select from an object representing a top level of hierarchical package programming, user defined program package to enable personal subscription service, causing subscription of the programming packages upon selections of the objects for predefined price for predefined time period and where the SOD service provides the content subsets at a predefined price for a predefined time period (fig.6, col.5, line 17-col.6, line 57 and col.7, line 5-59).

Knudson fails to explicitly teach providing VOD or on-demand program services.

However, **Hendricks** discloses network manager for cable TV system Headends, which provides program packages, IPPV, NVOD, VVOD, VOD, etc., upon request from subscribers as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

09/922,910

Art Unit: 2623

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q. Shang** whose telephone number is **571-272-7355**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-400pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher S. Kelley** can be reached on **571-272-7331**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

09/922,910

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Annan Q. Shang.